RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

THEFT ISSUES GROUP
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECTIG_25_0430**
DATE	**30 April, 09:30**
LOCATION	**Microsoft Teams**

Attendee	Representing	Initials
Anne Jackson (Chair)	REC Code Manager	AJ
Jenna Smith	Cadent Gas	JS
Laurie Edwards	Northern Gas	LE
Amanda Monaghan	Northern Gas	AM
Lisa Warnock	SGN	LW
Paul Hart	UKPN	PH
Alan Cookson	British Gas	AC
Dani Watt	British Gas	DW
Clare Manning	E.ON	CM
Jen Stevenson	E.ON	JS
Rachel Thorpe	E.ON	RT
Martin Lane	EDF	ML
Shamil Udayar	Npower	SU
Megan Cetera	Octopus	MC
David Lewis	Scottish Power	DL
Charles Anarfi	SSE	CA
Victoria Burkett	SSE	VB
Danielle Gibson	SSE	DG

Carole Coleman	Tomato Energy	CC
Ben Clark	Utilita	BC
Matt Cogram	Elexon	MC
Alisdair Jenkins	Elexon	AJ
Jayne McGlone	Xoserve	JM
Aiyesha Andrade	Retail Energy Code Company	AA
Jon Dixon	Retail Energy Code Company	JD
Lynne Fallon	Retail Energy Code Company	LF
Rebecca Lowe	Retail Energy Code Company	RL
Rosalind Timperley	REC Code Manager	RT
Tirna Sen	REC Code Manager	TS
Andrew Waghorn	REC Code Manager	AW
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JH
Eve Marriner	REC Code Manager	EV
Flo Monea	REC Code Manager	FM
Mica Thomas	REC Code Manager	MT
James Rees (Secretary)	REC Code Manager	JR

1 WELCOMES AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the ninth meeting of the Theft Issues Group (TIG). The Chair informed Members apologies had been received from Jessica Jarvis, with an alternate attending on their behalf.

FM informed Members that Slido will be used for the TIG meeting, to help provide more collaboration and engagement. FM advised certain agenda items may raise specific questions that Members can ask anonymously, which could help Members feel more comfortable asking questions.

2 CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

RECTIG Members noted the contents of the agenda. It was noted that one agenda item (item 10) would be brought forward (to before item 7).

3 APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

The Chair informed Members that due to the March TIG meeting being cancelled, the minutes from February's meeting had previously been approved, ahead of today's meeting.

4 REVIEW OF ACTIONS LOG

The Chair provided Members with an overview of the below actions on the Action Log:

RECTIG_24_1127_01: RECCo to investigate establishing a workshop to discuss the strategic review and prioritisation of theft project. - Open

The Chair explained this action will be discussed under agenda item 5.

RECTIG_25_0129_08_02 – The Code Manager to reach out to DNO's to understand their appetite for receiving a report for settlement purposes. - Open

JH informed Members work has been undertaken to understand the options around the report. JH explained engagement will take place with the Energy Networks Association (ENA) and wider Members to set up a meeting to discuss further. Timelines are still causing a slight issue; therefore, this action will remain open for the time being, with the intent on closing once an update on I0187 – 'I0187 Schedule 8 Review and Best Practice Guidance Development' is be brought to a next TIG meeting.

5 STRATEGIC REVIEW AND PRIORITISATION (WHITE PAPER)

JD provided Members with an overview of the Strategic Review and Prioritisation (White Paper), found on slides 6-8.

JD informed Members that the progress on various initiatives has now reached the point where a face-to-face workshop would be beneficial. JD highlighted the 'white paper' will be circulated in advance of the workshop and serve as background reading for the topics of discussion. JD invited Members thoughts on agenda, timings and venue.

JS noted the offer of Cadent's office in Coventry and this could be used as a venue for the workshop if required.

VB mentioned it would be beneficial if proposed speakers at the workshop are engaged with on their availability, before finalising a date on the workshop.

JD agreed to circulate a draft agenda to Members and welcomed any feedback on what they would like discussed.

Action: RECTIG_25_0430_05_01 – RECCo the circulate a draft agenda for the workshop to discuss the strategic review and prioritisation of theft project.

6 I0175 – INTRODUCING A REASONABLE ENDEAVOURS SCHEME WITHIN THE REC

JD provided Members with an overview of I0175 – Introducing a Reasonable Endeavours Scheme within the REC, found on slides 10-13.

AW highlighted it could be beneficial to engage with the Authority as early as possible on I0175, as Ofgem had concerns around I0173. JD agreed this would be a good approach.

No further comments were raised on I0175, however the draft business rules will be circulated to Members who will be invited to provide comments and feedback.

JS asked if this change impacted Suppliers, and not Gas Transporters. JD confirmed this to be the case.

JS asked who will fund the Reasonable Endeavours Scheme. JD noted several options are being explored; however, the proposal is for this to be a centralised scheme, funded across the whole market, similar to TDIS.

7 FITTING, MAINTENANCE AND RECORD KEEPING FOR METER SECURITY DEVICES

RL provided Members with an overview of Fitting, Maintenance and Record Keeping for Meter Security Devices, found on slides 13-15.

RL invited Members for their thoughts on the questions on slide 19 with answers being provided by using Slido.

The first question was ‘do you currently or have you previously fitted or trialled meter security devices for tampering?’ RL explained this question was to gain an understanding of whether Suppliers have conducted trials previously. The next question followed on from that, ‘if yes, what type of device and are you able to share any findings on the effectiveness of the devices?’ The next questions were ‘do you think there is merit on conducting a trial to test the effect of such devices?’; ‘do you think any trial should be conducted with one or two volunteer Suppliers or industry wide?’ and the last question was ‘do you think code changes are required to clarify the use of recording of and specification of security device and obligations, including in regards to any trials?’.

JS highlighted from their experience, before any type of product approval is granted, it has to go through the G23 process. This helps to know that the device is fit for purpose.

ML asked what the differences are between Meter Blocks and the Meter Security Devices. RL explained a Meter Security Device is a transparent enclosure that goes over the base of the meter, to protect the incoming and outgoing meter tails. RL advised it’s fixed to the meter board with a specialist tool, which is sealed in place and wouldn’t need to routinely be removed.

ML highlighted an industry wide trial would be useful, however there may be a need to keep it to a contained geographic area. RL agreed this approach would be considered.

A Member asked on Slido what the cost will be to use this specialised tool. RL mentioned the manufacturer that's proposed this scheme does have a tool in mind, but the costings are unknown at the moment. Following on from this, another Member asked whether the manufacturer would cover the cost of the tool. RL advised potentially they could cover the costs for the trial, however at this stage there is no commercial agreement in place, it's just the considerations which are required, with costing being one of them.

Another question on Slido was asked around the potential of replicating the tool and should there be any risk management in place to ensure that doesn't happen. RL highlighted that is a consideration, however, there would be a need to understand what the benefit would be for replicating the tool.

A Member raised a comment on Slido around the costings of the tool, with regards to small Suppliers as this might cause cost and resources issues. RL advised this will be considered when the size of the trial is scoped out.

RL thanked Members for their feedback and advised any further comments and thoughts can be sent to rebecca.lowe@retailenergycode.co.uk.

8 R0233 – INTRODUCTION OF AN ENERGY THEFT UNIT (ETU) UNDER THE REC

FM provided Members with an overview of R0233 – Introduction of an Energy Theft Unit (ETU) under the REC, found on slide 17.

FM informed Members that there are four questions available on Slido, to help the Code Manager gain an understanding of the feedback on the Change Process for R0233. FM advised the first question was 'has the role of the ETU been clearly articulated?' The second question was 'have the Change Reports covered everything you needed to know about the ETU?' The third question was 'do you feel like you had full visibility of the Consultation responses from the Outline Business Case conducted by RECCo?' The last question was 'do you feel like you had full visibility of the Change documentation for R0233?'

FM asked for Members to include any information they can in the Q&A box on Slido, which will help the Code Manager understand what they could focus on better during the Change Process.

9 R0234 – INTRODUCTION OF AN ENERGY THEFT REFERRAL ASSESSMENT SERVICE UNDER THE REC

FM provided Members with an overview of R0234 – Introduction of an Energy Theft Referral Assessment Service under the REC, found on slide 19.

FM informed Members that there are four questions available on Slido, which are very similar to questions asked for agenda item 8, however this time they are referring to R0234. FM asked Members to provide as much feedback as they can, if they weren't completely happy with the Change Process for R0234.

10 SMART ALERT BACK TEST

TS provided Members with an overview on the Smart Alert Back Test, found on slides 21-25.

AW noted that the first slide shows that analysis was limited due to missing timestamps on the Smart alerts. AW highlighted the Smart alerts come through the DCC; therefore, the data should have been highly structured. AW asked if there is an underlying issue with the availability of data that is on these alerts, and if there were, it would need to be resolved. TS explained their findings were that all Smart alert data had missing timestamps, and it was suggested that there needs to be a consistent approach in giving the right timestamp. AW agreed the need for timestamps, however noted the need to understand why they are not currently there. AW mentioned it could be an underlying design problem within the central systems or is it an artefact that wasn't there in the pilot.

The Chair thanked TS for their presentation and asked if they could return at the TIG meeting on 28 May 2025 to ensure a fulsome discussion after Members had reflected on the presentation and material provided. The Chair advised the meeting slides will be published with the post-meeting papers, and this will give Members the opportunity to digest the information in preparation for working to develop the proof of concept.

11 R0173 – IMPROVEMENTS TO TDIS (OFGEM LETTER)

JD asked Members whether they had seen the response letter that REC Change Panel sent to Ofgem, in relation to R0173. FM confirmed the letter was uploaded on the REC portal, as part of documents for this Change.

JD informed Members that Ofgem questioned R0173, as to whether it is appropriate to incentivise Suppliers to carry out desktop investigations, and in particular, given that it was stipulated they should originate from ETTOS, rather than being self-generated desktop investigations. JD explained another question Ofgem raised was if this would have an unintended consequence of inhibiting the extent Suppliers would collaborate on these issues. JD advised the send back letter stated the desktop instructions have been pinned to ETTOS leads, which should minimise the gaming risk.

JD informed Members the send back letter also noted there was a proportionality in the ETTOS leads coming through from Crimestoppers with all Suppliers receiving the reports based on their market share.

GE mentioned it could be beneficial to have a discussion with Ofgem around their theft strategy and what they would like to see in this particular area. GE noted the best approach would be for REC to wait for Ofgem to respond to the send back letter and then undertake what is needed for them to approve R0173. GE highlighted this can be kept on the agenda for a future TIG meeting to discuss further, if Ofgem have responded to the response letter. The Chair agreed this will be kept on the agenda for the next TIG meeting, to give Members the opportunity to consider how the communication line is kept open with Ofgem, in respect of their theft strategy.

12 FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chair confirmed the next TIG meeting will be on Wednesday 28 May 2025.

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