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_1112**
DATE	**12 November 2025, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Steve Brand	Code Manager	SB	Committee Chair
Martin Brailsford	MEM (Electricity) Representative	MB	Committee Member
Steve Mulinganie	Suppliers Representative	SM	Committee Member
Dean Berry	MEM (Gas) Representative	DB	Committee Member
Warren Lacey	DNO Representative	WL	Committee Member
Tracey Saunders	GT Representative	TS	Committee Member
Rebecca Griffiths	Retail Energy Code Company	RG	Metering Service Delivery Manager
Jemma Johnson	Retail Energy Code Company	JJ	Market Design Specialist
Jonathan Hawkins	Retail Energy Code Company	JH	Head of Market Design
April Harbour	Code Manager	AH	Senior Technical Services Consultant
Holly Law	Code Manager	HL	Change Delivery and Release Manager
Caroline Freimuller	Code Manager	CF	Senior Change Analyst
Bela Ashworth	Code Manager	BA	Change Analyst
Glenn Sheern	Code Manager	GS	Regulatory Specialist
Brogan McNess	Code Manager	BMc	Secretariat
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 08 October 2025. The Draft Minutes were approved by the Members.

3. REVIEW OF ACTION LOG

The Code Manager updated Members that there was currently one outstanding action on the actions log.

RECMEP_25_0813_02 - 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.

BM advised that this action would be kept open until February 2026 to allow Members to review the formatting of the Service Termination Issues Reporting Guidance (STIRG) document and request changes before the release.

WL queried the location of the approved legal text of the STIRG document from R0244. CF confirmed that the approved version is available on the Change Proposal Page of the REC Portal. CF clarified that the fully redlined version is titled *'STIRG Fully Redlined Post Consultation'* and is accessible via the change page.

GS and MB raised concerns about formatting issues and diagrams in the current version. GS confirmed these will be addressed as part of the February release activities. HL added that once redlining is accepted, a clean version will be circulated for final review.

RECMEP Members **NOTED** the update.

4. R0207 - UPDATED SOLUTION AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT

RECMEP Members were provided with an update on the R0207 Updated Solution and Impact Assessment.

HL advised that the Party Impact Assessment will open on 14 November 2025 for 15 working days with the Change Report (For Consultation) expected in January 2026. JH confirmed that Ofgem was comfortable with the revised approach.

The RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

4. METER CONFIGURATION TABLE

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

AH outlined a query raised by OVO concerning the urgent BSC Modification P503 and its impact on the REC Meter Configuration Tables. The modification seeks to temporarily unfreeze specific Market Domain Data (MDD) entities to enable new Standard Settlement Configuration and Time Pattern Regime combinations for Radio Teleswitch (RTS) Meters. This is intended to support load diversity and prevent Consumer detriment.

SM expressed concerns about reopening frozen datasets, highlighting potential disruption to Marketwide Half-Hourly Settlement (MHHS) programme commitments and regulatory expectations. SM noted that relaxing the freeze could undermine assurances given to Ofgem regarding programme stability.

MB raised concerns about the risk of misalignment between REC Meter Configuration Tables and MDD datasets, noting that any discrepancies could create operational inefficiencies. AH confirmed that guidance would be updated, including a dedicated Wiki page and formal communications to industry parties to ensure clarity.

SM recommended that messaging should emphasise the diminishing nature of RTS-related issues and avoid creating confusion in the market. AH agreed and confirmed that the Code Manager will ensure consistent communication.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

5. METER PRODUCT CHANGE

RECMEP Members were provided with an update on one Meter Product Change (reference MPD2025_027).

MP introduced the change, seeking to add one Meter Product with model code G4UNBV to the Meter Product Data (MPD). MP confirmed that no issues or comments had been raised during initial review.

RECMEP Members **APPROVED** MPD2025_027.

6. R0271 – CLARIFICATION OF ASP, AMI, AND EMO ACCESSION REQUIREMENTS FINAL VOTE

RECMEP Members were provided with an update on R0271 - *Clarification of ASP, AMI and EMO Accession Requirements for Final Decision*.

BA outlined the purpose of the change, explaining that ambiguity existed within REC regarding whether AMR Service Providers (ASPs), Approved Meter Installers (AMIs), and Electricity Meter Operators (EMOs) were required to accede to the code. While Schedule 15 explicitly referenced Meter Operator Agent (MOA) and Meter Asset Managers (MAMs), it was unclear regarding AMIs and EMOs, creating operational uncertainty.

BA confirmed that the proposed solution involved consolidating two conflicting definitions of ASPs within Schedule 1 into a single, clear definition, and amending Schedule 15 to clarify that EMOs and AMIs must accede to the REC, while ASPs accredited under CoMCoP are not required to do so.

BA noted that the change was purely legal text clarification, with no associated costs and benefits including improved clarity for market participants, streamlined accession processes, and reduced ambiguity for future entrants.

The Chair asked whether any consultation responses had raised concerns. BA confirmed that no formal responses were received during the consultation period, and the REC Performance Assurance team had verified that all relevant Parties were correctly acceded. TS queried whether this change would impact existing contractual arrangements. BA clarified that it would not, as the change reflects current obligations rather than introducing new ones. WL supported the clarification, noting that it would help avoid confusion during audits and compliance checks.

RECMEP voted unanimously to **APPROVE**:

- The proposed change solution;
- The proposed implementation approach (big bang); and
- The proposed implementation date of 27 February 2026.

7. R0269 - SUB-COMMITTEE VOTING ON PROPOSAL PLANS

RECMEP Members were provided with an update on R0269 - *Schedule 5 – Change Management: Clarity and Typographical Review* which was implemented on 07 November 2025.

CF explained that prior to the November 2025 release, all timetable updates were signed off by the Change Panel, even when the Responsible Committee was closer to the change. This often resulted in duplication and inefficiency: Change Panel members were approving plans they had limited involvement with, and the Lead Analyst may be required to take both an Extension to Plan to the Change Panel and the Change Report (For Consultation) to the Responsible Committee. R0269 amended REC Schedule 5 – *Change Management* so the Responsible Committee approves timetable updates after the initial plan has been ratified by Change Panel.

CF explained the main impacts to the MEP from the implementation of R0269 were an increase in the number of agenda items for approval and a likely increase in the number of ex-committee approval requests. CF confirmed it would only be changes to the timetable that would come to the Responsible Committee, and that other changes to the Proposal Plan (such as changes to the Responsible Committee or to the Change Path) would still go to the Change Panel.

SM questioned the practical value of this change, asking why RECMEP should approve timetable changes when they did not approve the original plan. SM expressed concern that this could become a ‘rubber-stamping’ exercise, adding administrative burden without meaningful input. SM noted that approving extensions without understanding industry impacts could expose members to accountability risks. SM further challenged whether members were expected to scrutinise changes or simply consent. SM stated he would refuse to vote if not comfortable, noting that members cannot be forced and this could create governance gaps. SM asked what the escalation process would be if votes are not secured and warned that without clarity, the process undermines accountability. CF took away clarifying the process for non-approval or abstention, with the Code Manager reporting back at the next meeting. GS acknowledged the concerns and confirmed that the Code Manager would review escalation procedures for cases where votes are not secured or members abstain.

TS echoed these concerns, stressing that ex-committee voting should remain an exception rather than a norm. TS emphasised the importance of allowing sufficient timelines for discussion during scheduled meetings to avoid rushed decisions and highlighted the risk of losing cross-party debate when decisions are made asynchronously. CF noted that the REC Change Team would only use ex-committee voting for the MEP as a last resort, and that wherever possible items would be brought to the monthly MEP meeting.

WL added that many RECMEP members have limited technical insight into certain changes, making it difficult to assess material impacts. WL suggested clearer guidance on expectations for committee members when voting on timetable changes. CF provided an overview on Extensions to Plan, Updates to Plan and Withdrawals as the three main types of timetable changes MEP are expected to see, including what information is usually captured in the report. CF also provided links to recently approved plans as examples for committee members.

JJ questioned whether the additional step added value or simply increased complexity, noting that smaller forums may deliver quicker decisions but risk reducing quality and oversight.

GS agreed that the process needs clarity to avoid governance gaps. CF noted that other REC committees impacted (the REC Technical Expert Panel and Performance Assurance Board) had welcomed the change.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

RECMEP_25_1112_01 – The Code Manager to clarify by the next RECMEP Meeting on the 10 December 2025 the process for non-approval or abstention and review escalation procedures for cases where votes are not secured or members abstain.

8. MONTHLY CHANGE TRACKER & QUARTERLY ISSUES TRACKER

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

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

9. METERING HUB UPDATE

RECMEP Members were provided with an update on the Metering Hub.

RG outlined proposals to enhance transparency of metering changes on the REC Portal. RG confirmed that the Code Manager team is exploring options to make updates more accessible to industry parties. One interim solution suggested was to compile metering changes into a spreadsheet and upload it to the Metering Hub, ensuring stakeholders can easily track changes until wider digital enhancements are implemented.

RG also confirmed that it is possible to introduce a separate bulletin email for safety and technical updates, conditional on sufficient volume to justify the process. This would provide clearer communication and reduce the risk of important updates being overlooked.

RG emphasised that these improvements aim to deliver better visibility and engagement while maintaining alignment with future digital transformation plans.

RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

10. AOB

Annual Survey Reminder
RG reminded members that the annual survey closes on 18 November 2025 and encouraged all members to complete and promote participation within their constituencies. RG noted that only three responses were received from MEP members last year, which limits the ability to act on feedback. RG stressed that higher engagement would provide more meaningful insights and accountability.

The RECMEP **NOTED** the update.

EX-Committee Voting Procedure
The MEP Members questioned the Ex-Committee Voting Procedure and requested for a RECMEP Members Channel or Chat to be made on Teams for reminders of when an Ex-Committee has been uploaded to the Portal for review. BMc took this as an action to set up.

RECMEP_25_1112_02 – The Secretariat to set up a RECMEP Members Teams channel or chat for reminders when Ex-Committee items are uploaded to the Portal for review.

Post Meeting Note: *this action was completed immediately following the meeting.*

Meter Technical Details Email
The Chair confirmed that updated guidance on MTDs had been circulated via email on 12 November 2025 and invited members to review and provide feedback.

EOMF
RECMEP Members were informed of the upcoming Electricity Operation Metering Forum (E-OMF) would be held in the afternoon of 12 November 2025 starting at 2:00 PM.

RECMEP **NOTED** the reminder.

Next meeting date: 10 December 2025