RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUES GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**10 July 2026, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter & Role	Representing	Initials
Carl Dennis (Chair)	REC Code Manager	CD
Aleksandra Maczka (Performance Assurance)	REC Code Manager	AM
Chelsea Evans (Operational Account Manager)	REC Code Manager	CE
Finn Deacon (Technical Services)	REC Code Manager	FD
Bela Ashworth (Change Analyst)	REC Code Manager	BA
Alexander Whiteman (Manager)	Moorhouse Consulting	AW

1 INTRODUCTIONS & HOUSEKEEPING

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

The Code Manager provided updates on outstanding actions from the previous meeting:

Action Ref	Details
RECRIG_26_0612_07_01	The Code Manager to develop guidance to standardise the missing meter exchange process.
Meeting Update: A Guidance document had been drafted and published ahead of the meeting. The guidance document was discussed further under agenda item 3. Following the discussion and feedback provided, the guidance document will be updated and provided to RIG members on 14 August 2026. RIG members were asked to provide written feedback to be included. **Status:** Open	

2 PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Code Manager (AM) provided an update on recent Performance Assurance activities. They advised that a Performance Assurance webinar was held on 07 July 2026, which covered a range of current topics and industry concerns. These included Annual Ratings, Data Cleanse initiatives, forthcoming sprint activity, TDIS calculations and other Performance Assurance activities that had recently been completed

Members were encouraged to review the webinar recording if they had been unable to attend the live session. No comments or questions were raised by RIG Members on this agenda item.

3 MISSED METER EXCHANGE – SDEP PROCESS GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

The Code Manager (CE) provided an overview of Missed Meter Exchange – SDEP Process Guidance Document, which can be found on slides 7-10 of the meeting pack.

CE presented a draft guidance document that had been developed following discussions at the RIG meeting in June. The previous discussion had highlighted that Suppliers were using a variety of different methods and workflows to manage missed meter exchange scenarios, creating inconsistency and additional administrative effort for parties processing these cases.

The Code Manager has produced guidance intended to standardise the process undertaken through the Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP). CE explained that the guidance was intended as an interim solution and that any enduring system or process changes would require a formal issue to be raised and assessed through the REC Change process.

The proposed approach uses the existing 'Missing Read' process type with SDEP because missed meter exchanges frequently result in incorrect or missing Change of Supply readings. Guidance had been prepared for both electricity and gas scenarios, with associated escalation routes.

To improve consistency, the guidance document proposes:

- Standard naming conventions for SDEP requests.
- Individual SDEP cases for each missed meter exchange, rather than bulk uploads.
- Consistent timelines aligned with existing industry processes where possible.

The proposed timeline includes:

- Initiating the process within five working days of issue discovery.
- Allowing either Supplier to raise the initial query.
- Three working days for the losing Supplier to engage with its Meter Operator (MOA).
- Two working days for discussion between the gaining and losing MOAs.
- Two working days for the gaining MOA to engage with the gaining Supplier and DNO before completion.

A RIG member expressed concerns regarding the proposal for individual SDEP cases, noting that bulk spreadsheet submissions were significantly more efficient operationally and enabled multiple team members to work on cases simultaneously. They highlighted that some other industry processes already accommodate extended SLAs when larger volumes of cases are submitted together.

Another RIG member acknowledged the operational efficiency of bulk submissions but noted the lack of visibility and tracking for individual cases. They advised that Suppliers often had no means of confirming whether specific cases were being progressed, creating difficulties when determining whether escalation was required. They advocated for a consistent industry wide approach.

Discussion then focused on the proposed escalation process and timelines. A RIG member suggested aligning escalation periods with existing REC Schedule 30 processes, allowing five working days between each escalation stage. They advised that consistency would improve manageability across Suppliers even if it slightly increased overall timescales.

Another RIG member raised concerns regarding historic missed meter exchange cases. They highlighted examples where requests relating to meter exchanges from 2023 and 2024 had been submitted. They questioned how far back Suppliers should reasonably be expected to investigate, suggesting that there should be a clear 'line in the sand' after which responsibility should transfer to the current Supplier.

The Chair suggested that a twelve-month limit, aligned with the disputed read processes, may represent an appropriate starting point. A RIG member confirmed that their organisation would generally support a twelve-month threshold and would push back on requests outside that timeframe.

Another RIG member noted that, in some circumstances, Suppliers were simply looking for historical meter information to assist with investigations, rather than expecting the previous Supplier to undertake corrective action. Another RIG member agreed that providing historical meter job information in these circumstances would be reasonable.

Another RIG member raised concerns regarding the long-term use of the missing read SDEP category for missed meter exchange cases. They questioned whether this could create confusion and dilute existing case types. They suggested exploring whether an existing legacy SDEP category could be repurposed for missed meter exchanges.

The Chair confirmed that the Code Manager would investigate whether any alternative existing categories could be utilised, although any permanent solution would likely require further development and Service Provider resource. They also highlighted that wider EES re-platforming activity could impact implementation timescales.

CE asked RIG Members to review the draft guidance document and provide feedback, for the Code Manager to assess and determine any updates that are required. The revised guidance would be finalised between 20 and 23 July, then published on the REC portal on 24 July. Members were encouraged to consider whether a formal enduring solution should be raised through the REC Change process.

4 UNMETERED SITES CSS AND MPRS DATA MISALIGNMENT

The Code Manager (FD) provided an overview of Unmetered Sites CSS and MPRS Data Misalignment, which can be found on slides 11-14 of the meeting pack.

FD explained that the issue concerns differences in the ‘metered indicator’ values recorded within CSS and MPRS for unmetered supplies, such as street lighting, illuminated signs and bus shelters. The discrepancy affects the alignment of data between industry systems and requires remediation.

FD advised that the Code Manager intends to undertake a data correction exercise once formal REC instruction has been received. Activities will include:

- Comparing EES connection type and metered indicator data at MPAN level.
- Obtaining CSS extracts and comparing them against EES records.
- Investigating root causes of any remaining mismatches.
- Obtaining MPAS data where necessary to complete analysis and validation.

Once the immediate data issue has been resolved, a longer term solution will be considered through the Technical Change Workshop process to prevent similar discrepancies from occurring in future.

A RIG member requested clearer timescales and broader industry communication. They noted that the issue impacts Distributors and Suppliers and stressed the importance of ensuring all affected parties understand both the issue and planned resolution approach. FD agreed to take this feedback on board and discuss communication requirements with the Code Manager.

5 KEY CALLOUTS

The Chair highlighted a number of upcoming industry activities and events, found on slides 14 & 15 of the meeting pack.

- Members were reminded that the REC portal replacement programme remains underway, with implementation currently expected around November 2026. More information can be found here.
- A new REC Governance and Stakeholder Advisory Forum (SAF) has been set up, to explore the new governance framework for the REC and the role of the SAF. Members can register their attendance here.

BA provided an overview of the current Change activities, such as Impact Assessments, Information Requests, Consultations and upcoming Working Groups, which can be found on slides 16-20 of the meeting pack. RIG Members were encouraged to engage where appropriate.

Members were also welcomed to express interest in a Pre-Payment Meter (PPM) Working Group. This Working Group would provide a forum for Parties and Stakeholders to discuss current challenges, emerging issues, and potential areas for REC Change in relation to PPM Consumers, obligations and processes. It is expected that R0037 – Prepayment Credit Balance & Debt Transfer Processes and I0329 – A Review of the Misdirected Payments and Debt Assignment will be discussed here.

Ad Hoc Requests

- I0314 – Crossed Meters Process: Clarifications and Support. The Code Manager will be drafting a guidance document following feedback provided through the Information Request and the July Change Issues Group (CHIG). Members are invited to provide worked examples where the Crossed Meters process has been successful. Examples will be anonymised for publication in the guidance document. Members were invited to contact change.management@recmanager.co.uk by the end of August.

6 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 FUTURE OF SWITCHING

AW provided an overview of a discovery exercise on the future of switching arrangements, being undertaken on behalf of RECCo, which can be found on slides 22-24 of the meeting pack.

The project is exploring potential future opportunities associated with switching purposes, digital technologies and AI. The work is not currently driven by any specific Ofgem policy requirement, but is intended to gather broad industry perspectives on how switching arrangements might evolve in the future.

Key areas of interest include:

- Current customer switching experiences and pain points.
- Potential applications of API and digital technologies.
- The feasibility and implications of same-day switching.
- Industry readiness for future switching reforms.
- The role of RECCo may play in shaping future developments.

RIG Members were encouraged to reach out with any thoughts and can do so by emailing alexanderwhiteman@moorhouseconsulting.com.

A RIG member asked whether the exercise would evolve into a more structured programme of engagement incorporating webinars, working groups or formal publications. AW confirmed that no formal

programme currently exists but acknowledged that future engagement mechanisms could emerge depending on findings from the discovery phase.

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

Next Meeting: 14 August 2026