RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **WHITE**.

Information is for public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

I0237 ERRONEOUS SWITCH REVIEW

MEETING MINUTES

DATE	**09 October 2025, 13:00**
LOCATION	**Microsoft Teams**

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Lorna Mallon	REC Code Manager	LM	SME and Chair
Jonathan Hawkins	Retail Energy Code Company	JoH	Director of Market Design
James Hardy	REC Code Manager	JaH	Senior Change Lead and Secretariat
Bailey Robb	REC Code Manager	RB	REC Performance Assurance
Joanne Rush	SSE	JR	Working group member
Lisa Doris	SSE	LD	Working group member
Michelle Dennis	Brook Green Supply	MD	Working group member
Leah Read	Valda Energy	LR	Working group member
Dane Wyper	Corona Energy	DW	Working group member
Fareed Ahmad	Maxen Power	FA	Working group member
Stephanie Catwell	Electralink	SC	Working group member
Komal Brown	ScottishPower	KB	Working group member
Tom Hunter	EON Next	TH	Working group member
Yvette Lawrence-Hood	Centrica	YLH	Working group member
Sandra Langan	REC Code Manager	SL	Consumer SME
Lucy Musgrove	EDF Energy	LMg	Working group member
Lee Parkes	Energy Ombudsman	LP	Working group member
Kieran McMahon	Octopus Energy	KM	Working group member
Olu Emmanuel	Citizens Advice	OE	Working group member
Ian Scougal	Electralink	IS	Working Group Member
Carl Dennis	REC Code Manager	CD	Operational Account Manager
Reece Stephens	Brook Green Supply	RS	Working group member

Zubair Iqbal	Ofgem	ZI	Working group member

1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

LM introduced herself as a Subject Matter Expert for the REC Code Manager, and confirmed the following agenda that was agreed at the previous meeting:

Agenda Overview

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review Minutes and Actions of Previous Meeting
3. Use of the Erroneous Switch Flag
4. How Long is Too Long? Timescale for Raising an ES
5. Service Level Agreements in ES Process
6. Rejection Reasons
7. How to Update Contact Lists
8. Multilateral ESs
9. Actions, Next Steps and Any Other Business
10. Date and Time of Next Meeting

2 REVIEW MINUTES AND ACTIONS OF PREVIOUS MEETING

LM asked attendees if there were any comments on the minutes from the previous meeting. No comments were received and the minutes from the previous meeting were confirmed.

LM confirmed that all set actions had been covered in the upcoming slides.

3 USE OF THE ERRONEOUS SWITCH FLAG

LM presented slides 5 and 6 of the meeting slides and explained what Schedule 30 and the Erroneous Switch Flag indicator currently says. LM highlighted that there is misuse of the Erroneous Switch (ES) flag, with the number of Switches flagged as Erroneous not matching the number of ESs agreed by the RET or D0301. LM explained that this is impacting data accuracy and related processes such as address matching.

LM presented a short term and long-term proposal to the working group. The short-term proposal was for a guidance document to be published on the REC Portal to set out that the ES flag should only be used once the ES has been agreed via the flow, with a longer-term option to consider Code changes that could be discussed at a future working group meeting.

Attendees were supportive with immediate publication of guidance on the REC Portal.

4 HOW LONG IS TOO LONG? TIMESCALE FOR RAISING AN ERRONEOUS SWITCH

LM presented slides 8 and 9 of the meeting slides and explained what Schedule 30 currently says regarding the timescale for raising an ES, highlighting that the existing timescales are 24 months. LM

explained that when the 24-month timescale was introduced over 10 years ago, it was expected to drop to 12 months following a post-implementation review, however this has never happened.

LM explained that the group had previously agreed to hold the discussion on the timescales for raising an ES. LM noted that they were unable to provide the data for the conversation but proposed that the conversation was had in this meeting, with the Code Manager presenting that data at a later meeting to reaffirm any decision.

LM presented different timescale suggestions with their pros and cons (slide 9).

KM and LMg supported a reduction in the timescales due to billing and Settlement constraints and Consumer experience.

JoH raised concerns about possible Consumer detriment if ESs are rejected post the applicable timescales and noted that in that the impact on the end Consumer and their Consumer journey due a reduction should be considered.

LM explained that an Energy Supplier who could not be in attendance at the meeting, had noted a preference of a reduction to a 12-month timescale once a REC Change had been implemented.

5 SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS IN ERRONEOUS SWITCH PROCESS

LM presented slide 11 of the meeting slides and explained the existing SLAs in the ES process and possible suggestion for changes to the SLAs.

Gaining Supplier (8 Working Days)

KM supported retaining 8 Working Days (WD) to allow time for the Energy Supplier to email their Consumer and give them a reasonable amount of time to get back in touch.

LD raised concerns about escalations beginning after 5WD and the pressure this may create for Energy Suppliers and cause unfair escalations. LD suggested the SLA should be reduced to 5WD or the escalation SLA should be increased to match the Gaining Supplier 8WD SLA.

MD noted delays due to waiting on Third Party Intermediaries (TPI). MD explained that their organisation has a lot of Consumers through a TPI, and if they are waiting for additional information and confirmation, they will need to wait on the TPI as they do not necessarily have the contact details to contact the Consumer directly. MD acknowledged that 8 WD is a good timescale.

Losing Supplier (2 Working Days)

LM proposed that the current 2WD SLA for the Losing Supplier is retained.

LD and KB raised concerns around the workload associated with the 2WD SLA. LM responded noting that REC Performance Assurance can address persistent delays.

LM expressed their preference that the 2WD SLA should be kept as there should be no reason for an Energy Supplier needing to extend as in theory they would not need to contact the Consumer to confirm anything.

Meeting attendees held the consensus that the 2WD SLA should be retained, however this should be re-visited for confirmation once the data is available.

Re-registration (2 Working Days)

LM clarified that the SLA for Re-registration applies to triggering the Re-registration, and not the supply start date.

KM and LD raised issues with Objections being made despite an agreement for the ES. DW also noted that manual intervention was required to avoid automatic Objections.

LM confirmed that Objections and Annulments would be explored during a future meeting but that consideration to Guaranteed Standards of Performance would also be required.

Escalations (5 Working Days)

LM explained that the current escalation period is triggered at 5WD, but this leads to a mismatch with the other SLA timings and questioned whether this should be changed.

KB and LMg suggested that the escalation timings should be reviewed following the SDEP improvements under Change Proposal R0122.

JoH clarified the existing escalation process in Schedule 30 and the SDEP functionality. LM confirmed that they would update the SDEP guidance to clarify the expectations and the timings.

6 REJECTION REASONS

LM presented slide 13 of the meeting slides highlighting the valid and invalid rejection reasons for ES for the Gaining and the Losing Supplier in both Domestic and Non-Domestic scenarios.

LM proposed that the rejection reasons for Domestic and Non-Domestic are separated, as presented on slide 13. LM also proposed that for the DTN flows, for the time being, is that the rejection reasons are not changed.

KM asked for more specific rejection reasons to be provided to support with transparency.

LD and JH raised concerns about valid contract rejections for microbusinesses.

LM confirmed that they would engage with Ofgem regarding rejection reasons and provide a draft guidance note to help provide further clarity.

7 HOW TO UPDATE CONTACT LISTS

LM presented slide 15 on how to update the operational contact lists that are published on the REC Portal due to these tying in with obligations set out in Schedule 30, clauses 3.3, 4.6 and 6.7. LM highlighted that it is an obligation to have a contact for ES, including a phone number.

LM reminded attendees that they should update their ES contact details via their Operational Account Manager (OAM) or by contacting the REC Service Desk.

LM noted that the REC Portal is currently undergoing a period of review, with a new functionality currently expected to include a self-service contact list.

8 MULTILATERAL ERRONEOUS SWITCHES

LM presented slide 17 of the meeting slides and explained that multilateral ES involve a chain of more than two Energy Suppliers who have gained the MPxN in error, either in the Domestic or Non-Domestic market. LM confirmed these still occur and are not well supported by current flows, before asking attendees for their views and experiences of these.

KM noted the lack of rejection options for the middle Suppliers.

JoH stressed the need for clear outcomes and responsibilities when it comes to multilateral ES with CD proposing a secure platform, similar to that available in cross-metering, for a multi-Party resolution of an ES.

LM confirmed they would explore possible proposals and bring suggestions back to the group at a future meeting to discuss.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

LM noted an upcoming face-to-face meeting held by the Data Communications Company on address data quality in November.

LM informed attendees that James Hardy will now be the lead analyst from the REC Code Manager for I0237.

LM invited attendees to raise any other business but no further business was raised.

10 ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Item	Responsible	Due
Draft and publish Erroneous Switch Flag Usage Guidance	Lorna Mallon	Before next meeting
Review options for reducing Erroneous Switch time limit	Lorna Mallon	Next meeting
Updated guidance on rejection reasons	Lorna Mallon	Next meeting
Engage with Ofgem regarding Non-Domestic contract issues	Lorna Mallon	Before next meeting
Review escalation process	Lorna Mallon	Next meeting
Explore multilateral Erroneous Switch resolution options	Lorna Mallon	Future meeting

Participants were encouraged to reach out via email (lorna.mallon@recmanager.co.uk, james.hardy@recmanager.co.uk or change.management@recmanager.co.uk) for further discussion or input.

11 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

LM asked for suggestions of dates and times for the next meeting. The working group agreed to a 90-minute meeting on following the November Changes Issues group on 06 November 2025 between 13:00-14:30.