RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

REC ISSUES GROUP
MEETING NOTES

DATE	**11 September 2026, 10:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Presenter & Role	Representing	Initials
Kev Duddy (Chair)	REC Code Manager	KD
Becca Fox (Performance Assurance)	REC Code Manager	BF
Helen Tang (DCC BCDR Manager)	Data Communications Company (DCC)	HT
Chris Stock (Tariff Interoperability Lead)	RECCo	CS
Elise Handy (Service Delivery Manager)	RECCo	EH
Ian Chalfon (Change Analyst)	REC Code Manager	IC

1 INTRODUCTIONS & HOUSEKEEPING

The Chair welcomed attendees to the September 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_0814_04_01	The Code Manager to facilitate a working discussion between affected Suppliers and REC Change Management relating to Switch Meter Readings under Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement
Meeting Update: The Chair confirmed that the meeting had not taken place yet and it will instead be arranged before the next RIG meeting. Those who had facilitated the discussion at the last meeting were advised to look out for an email concerning the arrangements. **Status:** Open	
RECRIG_26_0814_07_01	The Code Manager to investigate the filtering issue on the Operational Contacts List on the REC Portal.
Meeting Update: Testing had confirmed that users should be able to use the filter on the consolidated tab of the spreadsheet after enabling editing in Excel. This should resolve the issue previously experienced by some users. **Status:** Closed	

2 PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE UPDATE

The Chair reminded Members that there had been a change in the Service Provider responsible for REC Performance Assurance and confirmed that the new team was now in place.

The Code Manager (BF) introduced themselves as the Performance Assurance Manager. They confirmed that the Performance Assurance team did not have a substantive update to present at this meeting but welcomed any questions from Members. No questions were raised, and BF stated that the new team looked forward to working with RIG members.

3 DCC BUSINESS CONTINUITY DISASTER RECOVERY

The DCC (HT) provided an overview of DCC Business Continuity Disaster Recovery (BCDR), which can be found on slides 7-10 of the meeting pack.

HT advised that the DCC had first tested the relevant switching arrangements in 2023 and had subsequently conducted testing annually in a variety of ways. They explained that the DCC wished to undertake the current year's BCDR testing in the production environment. Testing during the previous two years had taken place in a pre-production environment which was described as nearly identical to production, but which did not provide a completed end-to-end test.

DCC proposed taking the service offline for a limited period while the production test was completed. This would allow a controlled, failover and failback and would minimise the risk to data arising from replication lag. The platform is hosted across two Microsoft Azure regions, with data continuously replicated between them. During disaster recovery, the service would run from a single region.

The proposed test had previously been run under load in the pre-production environment, including stress testing and other checks. DCC proposed two four-hour change windows. Within each window, the expected service downtime was approximately one and a half hours, although additional time would be used if required to complete checks and confirm that the data load was satisfactory.

The proposed testing window is Sunday 25 October to Sunday 15 November 2026. Under the proposed approach, traffic would be stopped temporarily and existing processing would be allowed to drain before the service failed over from the UK South Azure region to UK West. The service would then operate from UK West for approximately three weeks before returning to its normal operating arrangement. DCC had selected what it considered to be a relatively quiet period and had sought to avoid major releases, price changes and similar activity.

HT explained that the UK South region ordinarily provided resilience through three availability zones, with replication to a second region at the database and storage layer for disaster recovery purposes. DCC had previously operated from UK West and had not identified performance concerns. However, operating from only one region would be less resilient than the normal business as usual arrangement.

Learning from the 2023 exercise had informed the current approach. During that exercise, traffic had been allowed back through UK South because replication at the storage level was slower than expected, although no operational problem had occurred. The planned three week interval between failover was intended to provide additional flexibility and time for managing this aspect of the exercise.

Effect on Service Users

In response to a question raised by the Chair, HT explained that requests submitted while the service was offline could remain pending or return errors. DCC's preference was for connected Service Providers and Service Users to continue submitting requests so that the service would be treated as though it was operating normally. However, DCC recognised that some Parties might choose to stop sending requests to avoid creating monitoring or network noise.

Engagement Session

DCC had arranged an engagement session for Tuesday 15 September 2026 at 15:00 to provide opportunities for Stakeholders to ask questions and raise concerns. An invitation had been publicised through the REC bulletin, although the level of expressed interest had been low. Members were asked to share the details of the session with colleagues or contacts who might be interested. HT also confirmed that a supporting information pack had been prepared and could be made available in advance.

4 TARIFF INTEROPERABILITY ENGAGEMENT

RECCo (CS) provided an overview of Tariff Interoperability (TI) Engagement, which can be found on slides 11-16 of the pack, explaining what is required from Energy Suppliers over the coming months.

Scope of Phase 1A

Following Supplier feedback received through the November 2025 consultation, the original Phase 1 was divided into two phases. Phase 1A focuses specifically on publishing tariff information and does not include consumer specific tariff information, which is expected to be addressed later through Phase 1B.

Under the Phase 1A journey, a Supplier would publish its endpoint information to be made available through a central register. A TI user would then request the relevant tariff information through the standard Application Programming Interface (API). Suppliers would need to ensure that their API and endpoint were available, that public data could be returned in the agreed standard, and that the necessary information had been registered.

Implementation Timetable

The relevant schedule and Standard Licence Condition were already in place following changes earlier in the year. The technical documents, including the API Technical Specification, the Energy Market Data Specification document and the Standard Definition Document, had been baselined in May 2026. A final Phase 1A API consultation was due to close on 17 September 2026. Its purpose was to obtain any final comments before the API Specification was introduced into the REC.

Suppliers would need to build and implement the APIs and ensure that the supporting operational processes were in place. This included exposing endpoints, returning tariff identifiers and tariff details, registering the relevant information, engaging with RECCo, and establishing appropriate logging, error management and support arrangements. Testing material and a supporting approach were expected to be available for Suppliers to use during the implementation period. Suppliers were encouraged to begin building and testing early so that defects, possible blockers and questions could be identified and resolved before go-live.

A RIG member asked whether Suppliers should begin building and testing against technical documents that were still subject to consultation. They noted that even limited amendments could create significant additional build or testing cost for an individual Supplier. CS acknowledged the concern and explained that the documents had been baselined and shared with the industry in May. Working Groups had reviewed the material, and the changes identified since May were described as relatively high-level and not overly substantive. CS suggested that if no significant responses were received, the consultation responses and associated changes could be completed within approximately two weeks of consultation

closure. If substantial responses required further analysis and drafting, the process could take longer, although CS indicated that the end of October 2026 was considered the latest likely point at that stage.

CS highlighted that RECCo are keen to maintain visibility of Supplier readiness and avoid unexpected issues close to go-live, intending to manage this through the Operational Account Managers. Two principal touchpoints were expected. Initially to gather confirmation about whether the Supplier was in scope, who was leading the work internally, who should be contacted about testing, whether a plan was in place and whether the Supplier understood and was comfortable with the requirements.

A later check-in would focus more directly on progress. It would consider whether the build was advanced, whether the Supplier had engaged with testing, whether the February 2027 date remained achievable and whether any new issues had emerged.

5 DATA ERROR RESOLUTION MANAGEMENT

RECCo (EH) provided an overview of the Data Error Resolution Management process, which can be found on slides 17-29 of the meeting pack. EH explained that RECCo was engaging with each REC forum to ensure that Parties received consistent information about the Data Error Resolution process, why it had been introduced and how an issue could be raised.

EH noted the process had been developed following discussions at the Performance Assurance Board. They had identified a need for a single point through which data issues could be progressed and triaged towards resolution. The process is intended to improve data quality, establish ownership and accountability, support collaborative working and prevent issues from remaining unresolved because they sit across organisational or service boundaries. It does not replace existing industry forums.

The process can be used for known or previously unidentified data errors affecting a REC-governed system. It is not intended primarily for matters already being addressed through a change proposal or for requests that are solely seeking a technical build. However, where a Party is uncertain about the correct route, it should submit the issue so that the team can triage it and determine whether a technical build, change proposal, or another resolution route is appropriate.

Issues may also be discussed through existing forums before being submitted. A log will be made available on the REC Portal so that Parties can see which issues are already being investigated and avoid raising duplicates.

Parties should submit via the Data Error Management area of the Portal, under the Organisation Management main heading. A form is available for submitting an issue, and a placeholder is available for the downloadable issue log once that log is published. Parties were asked to provide as much supporting information as possible, including the nature and scale of the issue.

REC Technical Services currently operates the process, with RECCo Service Delivery Managers supporting resolution and triage. Their involvement is intended to bring together knowledge from across the different services that may be affected or may need to contribute to a resolution.

A RIG member asked at what point proposed resolutions would be discussed with industry Parties where those Parties were affected. EH confirmed Parties would be involved as appropriate. They provided an example where the process was used where data appearing within a REC service originates outside of the REC arrangements. In those circumstances, the team can trace the source of the information and work with the relevant external organisation to seek a resolution.

EH confirmed that such matters would remain covered by the issue log. Where an issue concerned information displayed in an Enquiry Service, the team would trace the source of the information and seek to progress the matter with the organisation responsible for that source.

6 RECCO ANNUAL STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

The Chair provided an overview of the RECCo Annual Stakeholder Survey, which can be found on slides 30-31 of the meeting pack.

The Chair advised that the RECCo Annual Stakeholder Survey was currently in a soft launch phase and would be circulated in earnest imminently. Members were asked to look out for the survey and to provide feedback. The responses would help RECCo identify opportunities for improvement, address matters that were not working effectively and inform future priorities.

The post-meeting slide pack would include a link and QR code through which Members could provide feedback specifically about the REC Issues Group. Members were encouraged to submit any constructive or positive feedback.

7 KEY CALLOUTS

The Chair provided an overview of the Key Callouts, which can be found on slides 32-33 of the pack.

Nominations for the Stakeholder Advisory Forum were open. Nominations were to be submitted to the Code Manager Committee contact and had to be made by a Contract Manager or nominated Alternate in order to be valid. Members were encouraged to consider participating.

Members were reminded that the Tariff Interoperability consultation was open and would close on 17 September 2026. Members were encouraged to contribute.

A Consumer Consent consultation had been launched recently. A supporting webinar was also being held on 29 September at 2pm to help Parties prepare their responses. The Chair advised that the details had been circulated and were expected to appear in the REC Bulletin.

The Code Manage (IC) 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 34-37 of the meeting pack. RIG Members were encouraged to engage where appropriate.

8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A RIG member raised an issue concerning Change of Supplier disputes. They advised that there had been an increase in cases where another Supplier rejected a proposed meter reading because it already held a meter reading for the date. However, the Supplier did not provide the reading on which the rejection was based.

The RIG member asked Suppliers to provide the relevant reading when rejecting a Change of Supplier dispute proposal on that basis. They acknowledged that this was not an explicit requirement within the guidance or schedules but considered that sharing the reading would help the proposing Supplier understand the reason for rejection and would be beneficial to all Parties. RIG members indicated support during the discussion.

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

Next Meeting: 09 October 2026.