RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUE GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**09 January 2026, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter & Role	Representing	Initials
Kev Duddy (Chair)	REC Code Manager	KD
Andrew Waghorn (Performance Assurance)	REC Code Manager	AW

1 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the January 2026 meeting of the REC Issue Group (RIG) and confirmed the agenda.

2 METER INSTALL DATE PRIOR TO MPAN CREATION DATE LEADING TO METER UPDATE ISSUES

The Chair explained this subject was discussed at the last RIG meeting, and a further update can be found on slide 5 of the meeting pack.

Guidance on this process will be circulated as a post-meeting paper, and Members are invited to provide feedback via email to enquiries@recmanager.co.uk.

3 PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Code Manager (AW) provided an update on Performance Assurance, found on slide 7 of the meeting pack, inviting feedback on two main items:

Clarification of Responsibilities on the missing ESME ID Report

AW explained the proposal to clarify which Party is responsible for data cleanse on missing ESME ID reports. For SMETS 2 meters, the installing Supplier would be responsible, as they should have the relevant data from installation. For SMETS 1 meters, the current Supplier would be responsible if the meter is enrolled. AW highlighted that the EES data now allows identification of enrolled meters, through the DCC status flag, enabling more accurate reporting.

RIG members were asked whether it remains useful for both the current and installing Suppliers to receive the report, even if only one is responsible, to aid awareness and workload planning. A RIG member supported the idea, noting that current Suppliers benefit from knowing about meters that they did not install, especially for resource planning. RIG members agreed that filtering by DCC status flag would help focus on meters requiring action. The RIG member also suggested being explicit about which DCC status flag values are relevant in the guidance.

AW confirmed that unenrolled meters would be excluded from the report, and noted the meter type is already included in the report so wouldn't split the report further.

Addition of MHHS Migration Status Field to Reports

Following suggestions from a RIG member in December 2025, AW brought a proposal to add the MHHS migration status field to all electricity reports. This field would indicate whether a meter is migrated, not migrated, or reverse migrated. The change is minor but requires updating all report definitions. RIG members were asked for preferences on the option to implement in February or March. No strong views were expressed, with AW confirming the change would be implemented as soon as they could and communicated beforehand.

4 DCC UPDATES

The Chair provided two DCC updates.

The first update was on the Switching Address Quality Plan, found on slide 10 of the meeting pack. DCC has released a consultation on their Address Quality Plan for 2026-2027. RIG members were invited to submit views by the end of January through email to consultation@smartdcc.co.uk.

The second update was on the JWS Certificates Renewal, found on slide 12 of the meeting pack. There will be a refresh of the CSS JWS public production certificates. CSS Users, or their system providers, must download and implement the new certificate by 17 January 2026, to avoid failures in async outbound messages. If systems can run certificates in parallel, the new certificate can be applied before 12 January 2026 (10:00-11:00). Otherwise, it should be applied during this window. Most Parties have confirmed completion, but any issues should be reported to the Service Desk, for DCC escalation.

5 RIG FEEDBACK

The Chair initiated a feedback session to gather input on improving RIG meetings. Attendees were invited to respond through Slido or discuss verbally. Key topics included:

Attendance

Discussions were focused on whether attendance should be limited to one representative per Party, or expanded to include relevant stakeholders. The current practice is more flexible than the original Terms of Reference, and feedback was sought on whether this should be formalised.

Value from RIG Meetings

Members highlighted the value of RIG meetings as a forum for initial triage and discussion of issues before formal change proposals are raised. The meetings help clarify responsibilities, share industry knowledge and awareness as well as prevent unnecessary change proposals.

Suggestions for Improvement

Suggestions included providing meeting materials in advance, offering topical presentations, and making the agenda more detailed. A RIG member proposed adding a column to the agenda to indicate which Party type or reports are most affected by each agenda item.

Recording and Updating Members

Members discussed the best way to record and update actions and issues. While a full issues log exists, it has not been maintained recently. There was support for a more formalised action log and regular action returns in future meetings.

The Chair confirmed that feedback would be used to draft changes to the Terms of Reference, which would be reviewed at the next meeting.

RECRIG_26_0109_05_01 – The Code Manager to draft changes to the Terms of Reference and circulate before the next RIG meeting for comments.

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A RIG member raised an AOB regarding address formatting issues affecting address matching for the REL. They referenced the '301868 address population rules' document and suggested that Parties, especially DNOs, be reminded of these rules to improve compliance and address matching.

The Chair agreed to include the document in the post-meeting pack.

No further business was discussed. The Chair thanked attendees for their input and closed the meeting.